DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 655 UD 017 173

AUTHOR	Strum, Irene
TITLE	Corrective Reading, Corrective Mathematics and Bilingual Instruction of Pregnant School Age Girls.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	148p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-61685; For a related document see UD 016 846 ; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Students; Guidance Counseling; *Pregnant Students; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Instruction; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Reading; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This is an evaluation of a program designed to provide continuity of instruction in reading and mathematics for pregnant school age girls in New York City. The program was designed to provide instruction for monolingual and bilingual (English-Spanish) students. Selected students were two or more years retarded in reading and/or mathematics. Spanish speaking students received English as a second language instruction. Nine hundred pregnant school age girls participated in the program. Seven hundred and fifty were involved in reading and mathematics programs. One hundred and fifty were involved in bilingual instruction. Three hundred students were in grades 7, 8, and 9. Six hundred students were in grades 10, 11, and 12. Diagnostic testing using the Individual Pupil Monitoring System (IPMS) was implemented. As a result of this program more than 80% of the students involved achieved mastery of at least one instructional objective in reading and/or mathematics. Evidence showed, however, that many students had mastered a significant number of objectives prior to instruction. Problems associated with the program included excessive absence and delivery of baby as well as staffing problems, a lack of sufficient materials and equipment and the late arrival of diagnostic materials. Appendices include tables of detailed information on criterion referenced tests used in the program. (Author/PR)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED142655

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-61685-6

CORRECTIVE READING, CORRECTIVE MATHEMATICS AND BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION OF PREGNANT SCHOOL AGE GIRLS

SCHOOL YEAR 1975-1976

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IRENE STRUM

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD017173

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

Dr. Richard T. Turner, Asst. Admin. Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

Table of Contents

Pages

Chapter I - Program Description 1

Chapter II - Evaluative Procedures 4

Chapter III - Findings 8

Chapter IV - Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations 24

APPENDIX

Discrepancy Checklist

Mailed Information Report and Data Loss Form

Program Abstract

List of Objectives

List of Tables

Table 1 - Distribution of the Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered after Instruction in Reading 8

Table 2 - Distribution of the Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered after Instruction in Mathematics 9

Table 3 - Distribution of Pupil Mastery of Instructional Objectives Prior to Instruction 11

Table 4 - Distribution of Pupil Non-Mastery on Pretest and No Posttest Follow-up 11

Table 5 - Distribution of Pupil Non-Mastery on Pretest and Not Showing Mastery on Posttest Follow-up 12

Table 6 - Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Instructional Objective As a Result of Instruction in Reading 13

Table 7 - Distribution of Student Mastery by Instructional Objective As a Result of Instruction in Mathematics . . . 14

Table 8 - Distribution of Percentage Level of Mastery of Instructional Objectives that were Taught 16

Table 9 - Differences between Pre- and Posttesting Reading in Spanish and English 17

Table 10- Differences between Pre- and Posttesting MAT-Mathematics 13

Chapter 1

THE PROGRAM

This program was designed to provide continuity of instruction in reading and mathematics for eligible pregnant school age girls and, for a portion of that population, bilingual English-Spanish instruction for the same purpose.

Students were selected for participation in the corrective reading and corrective mathematics programs on the basis of their being at least two years retarded in reading and/or mathematics as measured in grade equivalents on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) or the California Achievement Test (CAT). Students who received instruction within the Bilingual Component were those to whom English was a second language and who had served two or more years below grade level in reading and/or mathematics on the MAT and below achievement levels comparable to two-year retardation on the tests in Spanish.

The school population was composed of pregnant girls who were in attendance during the regular school year at one of the six facilities for pregnant girls in New York City. Two of the facilities also housed a Bilingual Component. Approximately 900 pregnant secondary school age students participated during the school year, 750 in corrective reading and mathematics and 150 in bilingual instruction. There were about 300 in grades seven, eight, and nine and 600 in grades ten, eleven, and twelve. Five of the facilities were day schools; the sixth, which was new to the program this year, consisted of six institutional sites located in the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Manhattan. The program was under the supervision of the Office of Special Education.

Student activities in the area of corrective reading were devoted to developing reading in the content areas. In addition, the program was designed to foster independence in the use of word-attack and comprehension skills. Through diagnostic testing, using the Individual Pupil Monitoring System (IPMS) in reading, student needs were assessed; specific treatment was recommended on the basis of IPMS results and from pupil-teacher, teacher-teacher, and teacher-guidance counselor conferences. Students engaged in such activities as working with reading exercises to improve word-attack and comprehension skills and reading for enjoyment. In some facilities Project Think was central to the prescriptive phase of the program, whereas in others EDL materials and equipment were featured; some sites did not emphasize any one particular commercial material. In all facilities, teacher-made and/or collected materials were used, especially in the institutional facility.

A similar diagnostic-prescriptive approach was implemented in mathematics using the IPMS in mathematics. Student activities were devoted to the development of basic skills, drills for the reinforcement of concepts, exploration of mathematics laboratory materials, practice in problem solving, and practice and reinforcement of skills in consumer mathematics. Where possible, calculators, comptometers, and other business machines were used in the program.

To improve reading skills in English and Spanish and mathematics skills, students in the Bilingual Component received instruction in reading, mathematics, social studies, and clerical and office skills in Spanish and English.

Each participant attended a facility five days a week, five hours a day, from 9 A.M. to 3 P.M. during the academic school year. A pregnant student remained at a particular facility through delivery, some returning to a regular school before the end of the school year. Thus, students participated in the program at a facility for varying periods of time. In five schools (911M, 921K, 931K, 932K, and 941Q) students received weekly a minimum of five instructional periods in corrective reading and five instructional periods in corrective mathematics. In P-912M pupils received approximately one period each week for corrective reading and one period each week for corrective mathematics. Time spent in bilingual instruction varied according to pupil needs which were diagnosed by teachers on the basis of the MAT and the Prueba de Lectura.

One corrective reading teacher was assigned to each facility except for P-911M and P-932K where two reading teachers were employed. One corrective mathematics teacher was assigned to each facility except for P-931K where two educational assistants were employed. Except for P-912M, each teacher worked with an educational assistant. In P-931K three educational assistants worked with the tax levy mathematics teacher to implement the program in corrective mathematics. Supportive services consisted of a guidance counselor and social worker in each day facility. P-912M had only the services of one guidance counselor. One school psychologist served all facilities. In P-911M a parent program assistant was employed in the corrective reading program to perform such duties as assisting students with homework assignments in reading, visiting homes, encouraging regular attendance and participation in school activities, and serving as a liaison with parents, school, and community. A teacher and paraprofessional were employed in each Bilingual Component.

In each facility classes in corrective reading and corrective mathematics were small: in most cases there were no more than ten students in each class; in some cases the teacher-pupil ratio was as low as 1:3. The Bilingual Component had classes of similar size.

Chapter II

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

As stated in the evaluation design, the evaluation objectives were given as:

1. "Evaluation Objective #1: To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the pupils master instructional objectives in reading and mathematics which prior to the program they did not master at the rate of one objective for each subject per month of instruction (maximum of six)."

2. "Evaluation Objective #2: To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives."

3. "Evaluation Objective #3: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the program of Bilingual Instruction in reading, the reading grade of the non-English speaking pregnant students in both English and Spanish will show a statistically significant difference between the pretest scores and the posttest scores."

4. "Evaluation Objective #4: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the program of Bilingual Instruction in mathematics, the mathematics grade of the non-English speaking pregnant students will show a statistically significant difference between the pretest scores and the posttest scores."

5. "Evaluation Objective #5: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal."

The extent to which the first two objectives were accomplished was determined by analyzing results from the two diagnostic-prescriptive tests, IPMS in reading and mathematics. The MAT or CAT grade equivalent scores, given at the time of entry to the school, were used to determine in which of the levels of the two tests a student should begin.

The testing programs for both reading and mathematics were similar and somewhat complex, involving substantial clerical work on the part of teachers. For example, teachers first used the student's MAT score to determine what level of the IPMS the student should receive. The student then was assigned a specific level of the IPMS to determine the objectives that the student needed to work on for improvement in reading or mathematics. The tests were administered individually, in small groups, and, in some instances, to whole classes periodically throughout the school year as pupils entered a facility. Test items were scored and results were recorded on an individual profile sheet, provided by the test publisher, that indicated which of the test publisher's objectives a student had mastered and which she had failed to master. There were five or ten items for each instructional objective in IPMS, depending upon test level. A student was considered to have demonstrated mastery of the objective if she correctly answered three of the five or eight of the ten items.

The teacher next recorded the results of this pretesting on class evaluation records, a separate sheet for each IPMS level, that contained the names of all the students in the class and the list of instructional objectives. The specific objectives in corrective reading and corrective mathematics are in the Appendix. Teachers recorded an "N" on the class evaluation record for a particular instructional objective if the student did not show mastery and recorded an "M" where the student did show mastery.

After completing part or all of the entry testing, students were assigned work relating to the test publisher's instructional objectives for which they had not achieved mastery. Teachers and teaching aides worked individually with the student until the teacher believed that the student had a firm grasp of the instructional objective. At that time, the teacher or teaching aide administered the "mastery" or posttest, again individually or in small groups. The mastery or posttests were parallel forms of the pretest. If the student showed mastery of the instructional objectives on this testing, the teacher entered an "M" next to the "N" on the appropriate evaluation record to indicate that the student had received instruction and mastered the objective. If the student failed on the second testing, she was assigned more work and tested a third time. This process was repeated as often as necessary.

The main limitation of the tests used in the evaluation was that they were designed for elementary school children and were being used with junior and senior high school aged girls. For example, a student could be in grade 10 and have a reading grade equivalent score of 8.0 which would qualify her for the corrective reading program; yet there would be no appropriate level of IPMS for that student, as the IPMS reading tests cover only grades 1 through 6. This was a minor problem in IPMS math since those tests cover grades 1 through 8.

At the end of May, class evaluation records were collected and sent to the evaluator for data analysis. The analytic procedure consisted of obtaining a number of distributions including: (a) the distribution of students failing to achieve mastery prior to instruction and not receiving sufficient instruction to achieve mastery; (b) the distribution of students achieving mastery prior to instruction; (c) the distribution of student mastery resulting from instruction; (d) the distribution of the number of objectives mastered after instruction; and (e) the distribution of the percentage of students achieving various levels of mastery.

The MAT in reading and the Prueba de Lectura were administered for Evaluation Objective 3. Objective #4 was assessed with the MAT in mathematics. These tests were administered whenever girls entered the program. Posttests were administered just prior to delivery if possible, after delivery if the student returned to the facility, or in May. Pre- and posttest scores as well as months in the program were entered on class evaluation records which were sent to the evaluator at the end of May. Data collected in the Bilingual Component were subjected to t tests for correlated means.

The results for the analysis of data for each of the evaluation objectives are presented in the next chapter.

The discrepancy analysis specified in Objective #5 was accomplished by the evaluator through site visits to each of the program schools. A checklist was developed from the Program Proposal that included all of the essential program components. During the interviews conducted on site, school personnel were asked whether the program components had arrived in a timely fashion and whether the appropriate components were functioning properly. A copy of the checklist appears in the Appendix.

Chapter III

FINDINGS

The first evaluation objective was to determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the pupils mastered at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they had not mastered at the rate of one objective per month of instruction (maximum of six). The number of instructional objectives for which students failed to show mastery on the pretest and subsequently demonstrated mastery on the posttest was determined for each student in reading and mathematics. The distribution of the number of objectives mastered as a result of instruction in relation to number of months in the program appears in Table 1 and Table 2.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION IN READING

			Number of Months in Program							
	Total		Less than 1 month		1 - 3		4 - 6		7 - 9	
No. Instructional Objectives Mastered	(N=667) No.	%	(N =18) No.	%	(N=282) No.	%	(N=312) No.	%	(N=55) No.	%
10 or more	5	0.7	-		1	0.4	4	1.3	-	
9	22	3.3	-		3	1.1	7	2.2	12	21.8
8	41	6.2	-		7	2.5	30	9.6	4	7.3
7	62	9.3	-		19	6.7	40	12.8	3	5.5
6	73	10.9	-		33	11.7	37	11.9	3	5.5
5	60	9.0	-		25	8.9	28	9.0	7	12.7
4	73	10.9	-		32	11.3	31	9.9	10	18.2
3	65	9.8	1	5.6	33	11.7	25	8.0	6	10.9
2	62	9.3	3	16.6	29	10.3	24	7.7	6	10.9
1	74	11.1	1	5.6	41	14.5	30	9.6	2	3.6
0	130	19.5	13	72.2	59	20.9	56	18.0	2	3.6

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS

No. Instructional Objectives Mastered	Number of Months in Program: Total (N=641) No.	%	Less than 1 month (N = 51) No.	%	1 - 3 (N=268) No.	%	4 - 6 (N=280) No.	%	7 - 9 (N= 42) No.	%
10 or more	2	00.4	-		-		2	00.7	-	
9	3	00.5	-		1	00.4	2	00.7	-	
8	1	00.2	-		1	00.4	-		-	
7	6	00.9	-		2	00.7	4	1.4	-	
6	18	2.8	-		6	2.2	8	2.9	4	9.5
5	47	7.3	-		18	6.7	21	7.5	8	19.0
4	80	12.5	2	3.9	26	9.7	42	15.0	10	23.9
3	124	19.3	4	7.8	50	18.6	62	22.2	8	19.0
2	144	22.5	4	7.8	61	22.8	76	27.1	3	7.1
1	121	18.8	7	13.7	61	22.8	48	17.1	5	12.0
0	95	14.8	34	66.8	42	15.7	15	5.4	4	9.5

The data in the tables show that the first evaluation objective was not achieved in either reading or mathematics. Although more than 80% of the students achieved mastery in at least one instructional objective that had not been mastered prior to instruction, the rate of mastery was below that proposed. The median number of months in the program was four, whereas the median number of objectives mastered in reading was four and in mathematics, two. About 50% of the students in reading mastered four or more instructional objectives, but only about 25% of the students in mathematics mastered four or more instructional objectives.

The first two tables also show the difference in the number of students in reading and mathematics. Thirty-six more students were tested in reading than in mathematics. This difference was due, according to counselors, teachers, and teachers-in-charge, to needs of students in meeting graduation requirements. Many had completed the mathematics requirement for graduation and needed other subjects.

The second evaluation objective was to determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which students demonstrated mastery of the instructional objectives. This was approached through four analyses. First, the extent that students had mastered the instructional objectives prior to the program was determined. Second, the number of instructional objectives each individual failed on the pretest was determined. These analyses were followed by determining the extent to which students mastered each of the objectives, and finally by determining the level of mastery for each student.

Table 3 gives the distribution of student mastery of the instructional objectives prior to instruction. The "percentage of mastery of instructional objectives" column numbers were determined by finding the proportion of the instructional objectives on which a student showed mastery on the pretest. The table indicates that almost 40% of students in reading demonstrated mastery on the pretest for less than 25% of the objectives. In mathematics, less than 20% of the students demonstrated mastery on 25% or less of the objectives. These data indicate that more difficult levels of the criterion-referenced tests should be administered, especially in mathematics.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES PRIOR TO INSTRUCTION

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Reading (N = 667)		Mathematics (N = 641)	
	No. of Pupils	Percent	No. of Pupils	Percent
Over 75%	94	14.1	91	14.2
51 - 75	142	21.3	228	35.6
26 - 50	176	26.4	206	32.1
0 - 25	255	38.2	116	18.1

Table 4 gives the distribution of the number of objectives failed on the pretest for which the student was not posttested during the program. Absence and delivery of baby were the main reasons reported by teachers for student failure to take a posttest. In reading, about half of the students were posttested and, in mathematics, a majority of the students were posttested - - i.e., they had indicated taking posttests, which is recorded as zero objectives not posttested in Table 4.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL NON-MASTERY ON PRE-TEST AND NO POST-TEST FOLLOW-UP

Number of Instructional Objectives Not Posttested	Reading (N = 667)		Mathematics (N = 641)	
	No. of Pupils	Percent	No. of Pupils	Percent
8 and more	23	3.4	5	0.8
7	7	1.1	4	0.6
6	23	3.4	8	1.2
5	30	4.5	16	2.5
4	35	5.2	18	2.8
3	52	7.8	38	5.9
2	63	9.5	50	7.8
1	77	11.5	77	12.0
0	320	48.0	400	62.5
None taught	37	5.6	25	3.9

Table 5 shows the distribution of the number of objectives failed on the pretest for which the student did not achieve mastery during the program. The table shows that a substantial number of the students in reading and mathematics had demonstrated mastery on each objective for which they were tested by the end of the program (61.6% and 74.8%, respectively) - - i.e., they had not indicated failure in any objectives at the end of the year, which is recorded as zero objectives failed in Table 5.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL NON-MASTERY ON PRE-TEST AND NOT SHOWING MASTERY ON POST-TEST FOLLOW-UP

Number of Instructional Objectives Failed	Reading (N = 667) No. of Pupils	Reading (N = 667) Percent	Mathematics (N = 641) No. of Pupils	Mathematics (N = 641) Percent
8 and more	1	0.2	-	
7	2	0.3	-	
6	9	1.3	-	
5	13	2.0	6	0.9
4	23	3.4	15	2.3
3	44	6.6	10	1.6
2	44	6.6	27	4.2
1	83	12.4	79	12.3
0	411	61.6	479	74.3
None taught	37	5.6	25	3.9

Table 6 shows the ratio and percentage of students who mastered each instructional objective as a result of instruction in reading. For example, the table shows that 455 students failed the pretest for objective 2203 and 311 of them or 68.3% later achieved mastery on the objective. Among the other 212 students in the program, either they were not tested on objective 2203 or they had demonstrated mastery on the pretest and do not appear in the table.

Table 7, which can be interpreted exactly as Table 6, gives the same results with mathematics objectives.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION IN READING

Instructional Objective	Ratio of #Pupils Achieving Mastery / #Pupils Attempting Mastery	Percent of Mastery
Structural Analysis		
2203	311/455	68.4
2204	295/408	72.3
2205	241/340	70.9
Vocabulary		
2301	210/288	72.9
2304	198/288	68.8
2305	194/352	55.1
Comprehension		
2402	129/255	50.6
2403	137/340	40.3
2404	167/297	56.2
2405	187/306	61.1
2406	253/352	71.9
2408	130/322	40.4

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS

Instructional Objective	Ratio of #Students Achieving Mastery / #Students Attempting Mastery	Percent of Mastery
Numbers and Operations		
1101	212/256	82.8
1103	147/260	56.5
1107	95/109	87.2
1108	106/133	79.7
1109	147/202	72.8
1110	154/241	63.9
1113	212/276	76.8
1118	82/151	54.3
Measurement		
1304	13/43	30.2
1305	143/197	72.6
1306	80/130	61.5
Problem Solving		
1901	137/299	45.8

In reading, objective achievement was consistently high in structural analysis and vocabulary; approximately 70% of those failing an objective on the pretest later showed mastery on the posttests in these areas except for 2305, word meaning, where somewhat more than 50% showed mastery after instruction. The results for reading comprehension were somewhat less successful. On only one of the six objectives did the attainment of student mastery exceed 70%. However, on only two objectives was the percentage of students attaining mastery under 50%.

Most of the instructional objectives in mathematics were confined to simple operations -- viz, addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Of the eight objectives that were tested in numbers and operations, none attained less than 50% student mastery as a result of instruction; performance ranged from over 50% to about 90% mastery. In the other areas tested, student mastery did not fare quite as well as it did for numbers and operations. Student mastery as a result of instruction ranged between approximately 30% and 70% in measurement and just under 50% in problem solving. It should be emphasized that not every student was tested and instructed on every instructional objective. An attempt was made to individualize instruction by assigning students work in only those areas that pretests had indicated weaknesses.

One of the best ways of indicating the extent to which students achieve mastery of instructional objectives as a result of instruction in the program is to examine the students' percentage level of mastery. Percentage level of mastery simply means the proportion of the objectives a student fails on the pretest that she later demonstrates mastery on the posttest. For example, if a student failed 10 objectives on the pretest and, as a result of instruction, demonstrated mastery on seven of those objectives, her level of mastery would be 70%. Table 8 shows the distribution of the percentage level of mastery of instructional objectives that were taught in the program. The table shows three substantial clusters for each area. There is a large portion (158 in reading, 230 in mathematics) of students who mastered every objective for which they received instruction. There is a smaller cluster of students in each area who failed to master any objectives (92 in reading, 74 in mathematics). The third cluster is concentrated between 41% and 90% in reading and between 31% and 80% in mathematics. Median percentage levels of mastery were in the 61% to 70% interval in reading and in the 71% to 80% interval in mathematics.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGE LEVEL OF MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES THAT WERE TAUGHT

Percentage Level of Mastery*	Reading (N = 667) No. of Students	Percent	Mathematics (N = 641) No. of Students	Percent
91 - 100	158	23.7	280	43.7
81 - 90	40	6.0	11	1.7
71 - 80	75	11.2	50	7.8
61 - 70	70	10.5	44	6.9
51 - 60	47	7.0	34	5.3
41 - 50	78	11.7	63	9.8
31 - 40	36	5.4	32	4.9
21 - 30	21	3.1	15	2.3
11 - 20	13	2.0	13	2.0
0 - 10	92	13.8	74	11.7
None taught	37	5.6	25	3.9

---

*Percentage level of mastery = (# objectives achieved)/(# objectives attempted).

The third evaluation objective was to determine whether, as a result of participation in the program of Bilingual Instruction in reading, the reading grade of the non-English speaking pregnant students in both English and Spanish showed a statistically significant difference between the pretest scores and the posttest scores.

Analyses of obtained data were not undertaken for MIR forms since excessive absence and delivery of baby resulted in fewer than 30 students per time span. The findings reported below are based on test scores of all students, regardless of time spent in the program.

Several levels of the Prueba de Lectura were used for testing reading in Spanish. Only for Level 4 were numbers adequate for statistical analysis. There was a statistically significant difference between pre- and posttest scores in Spanish reading among students tested with Level 4. However, this difference consisted of less than one question answered correctly.

In English reading, using the MAT, statistically significant differences were also obtained. Among junior high school girls, this was a three-month difference in grade equivalents and among senior high school girls, approximately an eight-month difference in grade equivalents. These data are reported in Table 9.

TABLE 9

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRE- AND POSTTESTING
READING IN SPANISH AND ENGLISH

	JHS Level	Secondary School Level
Prueba de Lectura, Level 4		
$\bar{d}$	.37	.61
SD_d	.38	.99
N	40	61
t	6.15**	4.82**
MAT - Reading		
$\bar{d}$	.34	.77
SD_d	.47	.70
N	17	20
t	2.39*	4.81**

---

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

The fourth evaluation objective was to determine whether, as a result of participation in the program of Bilingual Instruction in mathematics, the mathematics grade of the non-English speaking pregnant students showed a statistically significant difference between the pretest scores and the posttest scores. As was the case with the previous evaluation objective, this one was also attained statistically. Girls at the junior high school level increased their grade equivalent by five months, and girls at the senior high school level increased their grade equivalent by six months. See Table 10.

TABLE 10

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRE- AND POSTTESTING
MAT-MATHEMATICS

	JHS Level	Secondary School Level
$\bar{d}$	.51	.60
SD_d	.54	.58
N	34	55
t	5.42**	7.61**

** $p \leq .01$

The fifth evaluation objective was to determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, corresponded with the program as described in the proposal for the project. The results of this discrepancy analysis, accumulated from observations and interviews with principals, teachers, social workers, and guidance counselors while on-site indicated that generally the program as carried out coincided with the program as described in the proposal. Most difficulties in implementation were due to shortages of materials and turnover in staff. However, program personnel were able to adapt themselves and their practices to attain the proper implementation of the program. Moreover, preplanned training was generally adapted to meet the needs of new staff. The diagnostic-prescriptive approach in reading and mathematics was delayed at the beginning of the program due to the late arrival of the diagnostic testing materials. IPMS reading and mathematics materials had not been delivered to sites in September; therefore, diagnostic testing was not begun until October. At some sites certain levels were not available throughout the year.

The adequacy of materials and supplies varied among the sites. At some facilities, there was a lack of library books; at others, instructional materials, especially parts of the Think program, were inadequate. Although somewhat dissatisfied with the materials that are available, the Bilingual teachers reported they had enough for instruction; they also used a great many materials which they had designed themselves. Several schools reported a need for more equipment, such as tachistoscopes for reading instruction, cassette players, and calculators, and moneys for the repair of equipment. At the institutional sites, both instructional materials and equipment were inadequate. P-912M had been given only its share of the materials/equipment budget for this year without any extra funds to supply each of the six sites. As a result, teachers had to carry materials with them. Equipment was generally not available.

The unexpected high cost of IPMS necessitated the sharing of test packages among sites. Some schools did not obtain the levels needed until February or later and had to adapt the diagnostic procedures. Not all schools had cross-reference booklets to simplify the prescriptive process. However, by February, teachers were experienced in diagnostic-prescriptive approaches and had organized their materials according to IPMS objectives.

The layoffs throughout the school system caused changes in instructional and supportive staff at every site. All the guidance counselors in this program were new this year, the last assigned in February. At one school, the guidance counselor assigned by Central absented herself, thereby tying up the position for the year. Corrective reading and mathematics teachers were also newly assigned, necessitating intensive retraining. Not all training was conducted through the coordinator's office, but was offered independently by each school for its own staff.

During the site visits, it was observed that corrective reading and mathematics instruction was mostly individually oriented. Each student had her own folder to retain her work and achievement records. In most of the reading classes observed, students were working on individual assignments in workbooks, skill kits, teacher-made materials, or using cassette recorders or filmstrips. Some students were reading books. In the mathematics room, students were observed working individually in workbooks, teacher-prepared materials, and with manipulative materials. In some centers, all pupils worked individually on identical assignments at the same time. Calculators and other equipment were used minimally because there were not sufficient moneys in the budget to repair broken machines or purchase new ones. In both rooms, teachers and paraprofessionals generally worked with one or two students at a time. Corrective reading and mathematics teachers discussed student needs and progress with other staff members. Bilingual instruction tended to be mostly group oriented, following the traditional teaching approach, rather than having an individual instruction approach; however, groups were small, consisting of fewer than ten students.

The social workers and guidance counselors were a significant part of the program. They facilitated the academic and social adjustment of the students, such that they could attend, function, and learn in the classroom. Their work included conferences with students and their parents. Social workers organized and arranged meetings, and helped students with medical appointments and child care. Guidance counselors worked primarily on program scheduling, study and work schedules. They organized educational and vocational programs to motivate the girls to continue their education. They acted as liaisons with the students' school of origin. They worked closely and cooperated with the social worker to provide vital services for the girls' personal and academic development.

The quality of facilities varied from school to school. P-911M and P-921K are excellent sites for the program. P-941Q is located very close to an elevated subway line. Several times each period classrooms are wracked with the rumbling of a train passing by which hampers group instruction. However, the teachers have developed highly individualized instructional programs in reading and mathematics which compensate for this problem to some extent. P-932K also has a noise problem from a nearby train, but to a much lesser degree. At this site, most rooms are too small, even for instruction of only five pupils at a time. P-931K is a very small facility. The corrective reading lab is in a corridor leading to two classrooms and the social worker's office. The institutional sites of P-912M vary from adequate instructional space to corners of rooms; the sites lack adequate storage facilities for corrective reading and mathematics materials and equipment.

Absence is a significant problem in the program. Many girls are absent from school because of illness, scheduled doctor's visits for check-ups, and caring for their baby after it is born. Provisions to mitigate the effects of absence and to reduce absence have been undertaken. Homework packets are mailed to girls with stamped, pre-addressed envelopes included for return. Social workers have been successful in arranging medical appointments for girls so that they may attend part of the school day. They have also had some success in arranging coverage for babies so that girls may attend school after delivery. At some facilities, girls are allowed to bring their baby to school; in cases where infants were with their mothers in class, there was no disruption of activities. Providing day-care facilities and attendants could certainly increase student attendance after delivery. Significant reduction of pre-delivery absence cannot be effected since much absence is due to hospitalization and treatment requiring bed rest. An individualized, self-correcting instructional program requiring teacher input only periodically would give girls the opportunity to continue their education during pregnancy, even when they cannot attend school regularly.

The corrective reading and mathematics programs at P-912M were planned as weekly sessions. However, having six sites prevented teachers from serving at each shelter one day per week. The program was changed to two days approximately every two weeks to provide intensive diagnosis and instruction followed by practice for reinforcement. The first day was generally devoted to testing and instruction; during the second day the teacher continued instruction on the same objective, answering questions and checking to see that the student understood the work. Two weeks later testing for mastery occurred, followed by further instruction, if necessary. This procedure was thought to permit greater continuity than the original. After two months of experimentation, teachers found that pupil turnover was greater than 50% during a two week interval and that remaining pupils frequently required re-orientation to the remediation program. The original plan was therefore re-introduced; corrective reading and mathematics teachers went to a different shelter each day, returning to the same site every seventh school day.

The corrective reading, corrective mathematics, and bilingual programs were designed for pregnant girls who had no handicaps. However, some of the day centers had pregnant girls enrolled in the program who were physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed, or mentally retarded. Most of the girls in one school were originally referred from classes for socially maladjusted; some were found to be mentally retarded as well.

Funds were not budgeted for trips.

Recommendations from the last prior study were: (1) improvement of the physical plant at P-941Q; (2) expansion of the equipment budget; (3) change of test for the Bilingual Component; (4) an additional bilingual teacher; (5) expansion of medical facilities; (6) provision of day-care facilities.

Heavy curtains and extension of the existing air circulation system were to have been installed at P-941Q. Lack of funds prevented this work as well as the purchase of extra equipment and the addition of the bilingual teacher. Those recommendations relating to medical and daycare facilities could not be implemented through Title I funds. However, most facilities had a nurse available at least on a part-time basis; at P-931K a nurse was employed fulltime through Project Teen-Aid. At some facilities, students were able to bring their infant to school.

Research into achievement tests for the Bilingual Component showed that the Prueba de Lectura was the best available instrument. The MAT in mathematics was used to determine mathematics achievement instead of the Cooperative InterAmerican Test used in the prior year. Program staff would like to introduce a diagnostic-prescriptive approach in the Bilingual Component; however, SED regulations do not permit using available tests in Spanish as criterion-referenced tests.

Chapter IV

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on an analysis of test results and site visits, it was determined that the program provided a vital service to pregnant school age girls who were two or more years retarded in reading and/or mathematics and to those in the Bilingual Component. More than 80% of the students in reading and mathematics achieved mastery in at least one instructional objective, figures that were below the program goal of 70% achieving mastery in one instructional objective per month of instruction. Many students had mastered a significant number of objectives prior to instruction, and some teachers administered relatively few objective tests to their students. Excessive absence and delivery of baby were additional explanations given by teachers. Reading instruction was most effective in structural analysis and vocabulary, and somewhat less effective in reading comprehension. In mathematics, objective achievement was most prominent in numbers and operations. At the program's conclusion, more than 60% of the students in reading and more than 70% of the students in mathematics had achieved mastery on all objectives for which they had previously failed. In the Bilingual component, statistically significant increases in reading and mathematics were obtained.

A discrepancy analysis indicated that there could have been serious problems associated with staffing and lack of sufficient materials and equipment as well as late arrival of diagnostic materials. The effectiveness of staff was responsible for program successes despite adverse conditions.

It is strongly recommended that the program be continued.

Recommendations

1. A larger facility should be obtained for P-931K, rooms should be enlarged at P-932K, and previously suggested improvements should be implemented at P-941Q. The institutional facilities should be furnished with storage cabinets and bookcases.

2. Since IPMS costs exceed $500, more than $100 should be budgeted per site for test materials.

3. Funds should be included in the budget for additional reading and mathematics materials, particularly for P-912M. Each shelter should be provided with library books and a basic reading program to implement prescriptions.

4. The equipment budget should be expanded so as to include funds for additional tachistoscopes, cassette players, calculators, and moneys for the repair of broken equipment. Each shelter should have at least one cassette player and calculator.

5. Special provision should be made for handicapped girls.

6. More appropriate evaluation instruments should be selected and/or developed for the Bilingual Component. If Prueba de Lectura is used again, levels other than Level 4 should be selected.

7. For P-912M and pregnant girls who are absent for periods of one week or more, self-correcting instructional materials should be acquired in order to provide continuity in instruction. A paraprofessional should be assigned the responsibility of distributing and collecting materials, follow-up, and mastery testing.

8. To provide remediation in reading and mathematics to girls in P-912M, two teachers should be employed in corrective reading and corrective mathematics, respectively. If it is not possible to increase personnel, a schedule should be adopted so that three sites receive the services of the

corrective reading teacher for one semester, while the other three receive the services of the corrective mathematics teacher. At the end of the fall semester, the teachers should change sites. In this way an intensive remedial program may be undertaken that will provide for greater continuity in the education of girls in the shelters. In addition, fewer materials would be required.

9. Training sessions for professional and paraprofessional staff should be ongoing, with sessions scheduled in the fall and spring of the school year. Methods for selecting appropriate levels of IPMS in reading and mathematics should be a topic in an early workshop. Teachers in P-912M should be provided with regular opportunities for professional interchange which cannot be done within the existing schedule.

10. Health and guidance materials, with emphasis on child care, need to be integrated more thoroughly into the programs. Although some teachers did use health and guidance materials in their instruction, an attempt should be made to expand this activity more thoroughly.

DISCREPANCY CHECKLIST

	911M	921X	931K	932K	941Q	912M
PERSONNEL						
corrective reading teachers						
corrective math teachers						
guidance counselor						
social worker						
school psychologist						
educational assistants (r)						
(m)						
parent program asst.						
STAFF TRAINING						
Oct						
Dec						
March						
ACTIVITIES						
meetings with subject teachers						
(r)						
(m)						
meetings with g.c., s.w.						
(r)						
(m)						
meetings with parents						
(r)						
(m)						
staff conferences						
(r)						
(m)						
para training						
(r)						
(m)						
FREQUENCY OF STUDENT ATTENDANCE						
reading						
math						
TRIPS						
to local library						
other trips						
#						
where						

Bilingual program:
911 m
921X

	911M	921X	931K	932K	941Q	912M
READING						
Planning long-range instructional program						
Criterion scores on file test						
Student independent reading						
reading exercises						
use IPMS levels:						
EDL materials: audex, projector						
cassette tape recorder						
TV						
movie screen						
autoharps						
overhead projector						
softwear						
tachistosoppes						
vocabulary lists - subject teach.						
MATH						
Criterion scores on file test						
use IPMS levels:						
Madison math lab						
cuisinere rods						
calculator						
comptometer						
key punch						
consumer math						
drill texts						

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

1975-76 School Year

Due Date: July 1, 1976

SED Project Number: | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 6 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only): | 0 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 5 |

Project Title Corrective Reading, Corrective Mathematics Instruction of Pregnant School Age Girls

School District Name Board of Education - New York City

School District Address 110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Irene S. Strum

Title School Research Associate

Telephone Number 212 (Area Code) 596-8376

Date this form was completed 6 / 17 / 76.

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	5	0	0	2	2	0	3	Houghton-Mifflin	2	6	3	3	-
							2	2	0	4	"	"	3	3	2	1
							2	2	0	5	"	"	5	4	2	2
							2	3	0	1	"	"	-	4	1	3
							2	3	0	4	"	"	-	4	2	2
							2	3	0	5	"	"	1	3	1	2
							2	4	0	2	"	"	1	3	2	1
							2	4	0	3	"	"	-	4	-	4
							2	4	0	4	"	"	-	4	2	2
							2	4	0	5	"	"	2	2	2	-
							2	4	0	6	"	"	-	4	4	-

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	5	0	0	2	4	0	8	Houghton-Mifflin	2	-	4	2	2
							2	2	0	3	"	3	13	22	11	11
							2	2	0	4	"	"	13	23	10	13
							2	2	0	5	"	"	7	28	12	16
							2	3	0	1	"	"	5	15	2	13
							2	3	0	4	"	"	5	16	7	9
							2	3	0	5	"	"	4	12	4	8
							2	4	0	2	"	"	9	3	1	2
							2	4	0	3	"	"	4	8	-	8
							2	4	0	4	"	"	6	9	8	1
							2	4	0	5	"	"	8	7	2	5

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	5	0	0	2	4	0	6	H-M	3	8	11	7	4
							2	4	0	8	"	"	3	10	4	6
							2	2	0	3	"	4	10	51	27	24
							2	2	0	4	"	"	16	45	27	18
							2	2	0	5	"	"	19	42	29	13
							2	3	0	1	"	"	21	35	18	17
							2	3	0	4	"	"	16	37	22	15
							2	3	0	5	"	"	14	41	15	26
							2	4	0	2	"	"	6	33	16	17
							2	4	0	3	"	"	10	40	11	29
							2	4	0	4	"	"	15	37	17	20

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	5	0	0	2	4	0	5	H-M	4	11	39	21	18
							2	4	0	6	"	"	8	44	27	17
							2	4	0	8	"	"	9	43	10	33
							2	2	0	3	"	5	14	48	27	21
							2	2	0	4	"	"	22	41	33	3
							2	2	0	5	"	"	24	38	27	11
							2	3	0	1	"	"	28	31	22	9
							2	3	0	4	"	"	27	31	21	10
							2	3	0	5	"	"	20	38	21	17
							2	4	0	2	"	"	5	29	13	16
							2	4	0	3	"	"	15	39	13	26

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	8	1	5	0	0	2	4	0	4	H-M	5	20	38	17	21
							2	4	0	5	"	"	13	40	24	16
							2	4	0	6	"	"	23	37	31	6
							2	4	0	8	"	"	15	41	13	28
							2	2	0	3	"	6	7	35	22	13
							2	2	0	4	"	"	16	25	17	8
							2	2	0	5	"	"	29	14	13	1
							2	3	0	1	"	"	25	15	11	4
							2	3	0	4	"	"	28	13	9	4
							2	3	0	5	"	"	21	20	12	8
							2	4	0	2	"	"	5	12	3	9

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 5 0 0	2 4 0 3	H-M	6	17	20	9	11
	2 4 0 4	"	"	25	16	7	9
	2 4 0 5	"	"	15	24	15	9
	2 4 0 6	"	"	16	25	13	12
	2 4 0 8	"	"	23	16	8	8
6 0 9 1 6 0 0	2 2 0 3	"	2	8	3	1	2
	2 2 0 4	"	"	1	1	-	1
	2 2 0 5	"	"	8	3	2	1
	2 3 0 1	"	"	-	1	-	1
	2 3 0 4	"	"	-	1	1	-
	2 3 0 5	"	"	1	-	-	-

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 6 0 0	2 4 0 2	H-M	2	1	-	-	-
	2 4 0 3	"	"	1	-	-	-
	2 4 0 4	"	"	1	-	-	-
	2 4 0 5	"	"	1	-	-	-
	2 4 0 6	"	"	1	-	-	-
	2 4 0 8	"	"	-	1	1	-
	2 2 0 3	"	3	16	22	15	7
	2 2 0 4	"	"	27	11	4	7
	2 2 0 5	"	"	22	15	8	7
	2 3 0 1	"	"	7	7	6	1
	2 3 0 4	"	"	9	7	5	2

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	6	0	0	2	3	0	5	H-M	3	5	10	5	5
							2	4	0	2	"	"	3	9	2	7
							2	4	0	3	"	"	2	2	-	2
							2	4	0	4	"	"	5	8	6	2
							2	4	0	5	"	"	8	4	1	3
							2	4	0	6	"	"	4	10	3	7
							2	4	0	8	"	"	2	11	3	8
							2	2	0	3	"	4	39	49	28	21
							2	2	0	4	"	"	28	58	38	20
							2	2	0	5	"	"	29	59	38	21
							2	3	0	1	"	"	35	39	32	7

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
				No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6 0 8 1 6 0 0	2 3 0 4	H-M	4	30	43	27	16
	2 3 0 5	"	"	28	57	21	36
	2 4 0 2	"	"	9	36	26	10
	2 4 0 3	"	"	16	45	10	35
	2 4 0 4	"	"	26	43	27	16
	2 4 0 5	"	"	19	42	27	15
	2 4 0 6	"	"	22	51	23	28
	2 4 0 8	"	"	14	51	13	38
	2 2 0 3	"	5	34	89	70	19
	2 2 0 4	"	"	47	75	68	7
	2 2 0 5	"	"	55	66	52	14

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	6	0	0	2	3	0	1	H-M	5	59	54	47	7
							2	3	0	4	"	"	59	53	43	10
							2	3	0	5	"	"	41	67	42	25
							2	4	0	2	"	"	17	58	27	31
							2	4	0	3	"	"	19	81	40	41
							2	4	0	4	"	"	45	65	36	29
							2	4	0	5	"	"	31	67	42	25
							2	4	0	6	"	"	37	73	61	12
							2	4	0	8	"	"	34	68	29	39
							2	2	0	3	"	6	50	133	107	26
							2	2	0	4	"	"	70	126	96	30

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	6	0	0	2	2	0	5	H-M	6	115	71	58	13
							2	3	0	1	"	"	86	87	71	16
							2	3	0	4	"	"	87	83	61	22
							2	3	0	5	"	"	71	104	73	31
							2	4	0	2	"	"	43	72	39	33
							2	4	0	3	"	"	61	101	54	47
							2	4	0	4	"	"	91	77	47	30
							2	4	0	5	"	"	81	81	53	28
							2	4	0	6	"	"	77	97	84	13
							2	4	0	8	"	"	86	77	47	30

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	9	1	5	0	0	1	1	0	1	Houghton-Mifflin	2	3	-		
							1	1	0	3	"	"	-	2	2	-
							1	1	0	7	"	"	1	2	2	-
							1	1	0	8	"	"	2	1	-	1
							1	1	0	9	"	"	-	2	-	2
							1	1	1	0	"	"	-	2	1	1
							1	1	1	3	"	"	3	-	-	-
							1	1	1	8	"	"	-	2	1	1
							1	3	0	4	"	"	2	-	-	-
							1	3	0	5	"	"	1	1	-	1
							1	3	0	6	"	"	2	1	1	-

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	9	1	5	0	0	1	9	0	1	Houghton-Mifflin	2	1	2	-	2
							1	1	0	1	"	3	12	13	11	2
							1	1	0	3	"	"	5	20	9	11
							1	1	0	7	"	"	21	4	4	-
							1	1	0	8	"	"	13	12	10	2
							1	1	0	9	"	"	7	18	14	4
							1	1	1	0	"	"	2	23	12	11
							1	1	1	3	"	"	11	14	12	2
							1	1	1	8	"	"	3	12	2	10
							1	3	0	4	"	"	7	8	1	7
							1	3	0	5	"	"	8	16	11	5

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 9 1 5 0 0	1 3 0 6	Houghton-Mifflin	3	2	23	9	14
	1 9 0 1	"	"	3	22	11	11
	1 1 0 1	"	4	50	52	38	14
	1 1 0 3	"	"	5	42	12	30
	1 1 0 7	"	"	79	22	17	5
	1 1 0 8	"	"	67	29	22	7
	1 1 0 9	"	"	39	27	13	14
	1 1 1 0	"	"	22	41	21	20
	1 1 1 3	"	"	26	50	36	14
	1 1 1 8	"	"	6	31	17	14
	1 3 0 4	"	"	3	16	3	13

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils Passing (1)	No. of Pupils Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	9	1	5	0	0	1	3	0	5	Houghton-Mifflin	4	41	37	25	12
							1	3	0	6	"	"	20	20	10	10
							1	9	0	1	"	"	18	49	15	34
							1	1	0	1	"	5	33	17	14	3
							1	1	0	3	"	"	7	39	22	17
							1	1	0	7	"	"	55	11	8	3
							1	1	0	8	"	"	54	11	10	1
							1	1	0	9	"	"	36	13	11	2
							1	1	1	0	"	"	29	19	14	5
							1	1	1	3	"	"	15	32	20	12
							1	1	1	8	"	"	1	14	7	7

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 9 1 5 0 0	1 3 0 4	Houghton-Mifflin	5	1	14	2	12
	1 3 0 5	"	"	21	22	18	4
	1 3 0 6	"	"	14	16	12	4
	1 9 0 1	"	"	7	31	15	16
	1 1 0 1	"	6	7	5	4	1
	1 1 0 3	"	"	2	4	2	2
	1 1 0 7	"	"	11	1	-	1
	1 1 0 8	"	"	10	2	1	1
	1 1 0 9	"	"	8	1	1	-
	1 1 1 0	"	"	8	-	-	-
	1 1 1 3	"	"	1	5	4	1

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	9	1	5	0	0	1	1	1	8	Houghton-Mifflin	6	1	5	4	1
							1	3	0	4	"	"	4	2	1	1
							1	3	0	5	"	"	5	1	1	-
							1	3	0	6	"	"	5	1	1	-
							1	9	0	1	"	"	3	7	4	3
							1	1	0	1	"	7	2	1	1	-
							1	1	0	3	"	"	1	-	-	-
							1	1	0	7	"	"	3	-	-	-
							1	1	0	8	"	"	3	-	-	-
							1	1	0	9	"	"	2	1	1	-
							1	1	1	0	"	"	2	1	1	-

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	9	1	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	Houghton-Mifflin	7	-	1	1	-
							1	1	1	8	"	"	-	1	1	-
							1	3	0	4	"	"	1	-	-	-
							1	3	0	5	"	"	1	-	-	-
							1	3	0	6	"	"	1	-	-	-
							1	9	0	1	"	"	1	2	2	-
6	0	9	1	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	"	2	3	3	3	-
							1	1	0	3	"	"	1	4	3	1
							1	1	0	7	"	"	2	4	4	-
							1	1	0	8	"	"	2	4	2	2
							1	1	0	9	"	"	-	5	4	1

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
				No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6 0 9 1 6 0 0	1 1 1 0	Houghton-Mifflin	2	-	5	3	2
	1 1 1 3	"	"	-	6	6	-
	1 1 1 8	"	"	1	4	1	3
	1 3 0 4	"	"	5	-	-	-
	1 3 0 5	"	"	3	2	2	-
	1 3 0 6	"	"	4	2	2	-
	1 9 0 1	"	"	-	6	2	4
	1 1 0 1	"	3	7	4	3	1
	1 1 0 3	"	"	1	10	4	6
	1 1 0 7	"	"	10	1	1	-
	1 1 0 8	"	"	8	3	3	-

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	9	1	6	0	0	1	1	0	9	Houghton-Mifflin	3	6	6	2	4
							1	1	1	0	"	"	2	9	5	4
							1	1	1	3	"	"	7	4	2	2
							1	1	1	8	"	"	-	3	1	2
							1	3	0	4	"	"	1	2	-	2
							1	3	0	5	"	"	1	9	6	3
							1	3	0	6	"	"	2	9	6	3
							1	9	0	1	"	"	2	9	5	4
							1	1	0	1	"	4	77	71	60	11
							1	1	0	3	"	"	27	35	25	10
							1	1	0	7	"	"	107	26	25	1

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	9	1	6	0	0	1	1	0	8	Houghton-Mifflin	4	104	25	20	5
							1	1	0	9	"	"	72	50	39	11
							1	1	1	0	"	"	51	56	38	18
							1	1	1	3	"	"	37	81	64	17
							1	1	1	8	"	"	13	32	17	15
							1	3	0	4	"	"	14	13	1	12
							1	3	0	5	"	"	66	42	30	12
							1	3	0	6	"	"	23	27	14	13
							1	9	0	1	"	"	35	67	27	40
							1	1	0	1	"	5	70	50	43	7
							1	1	0	3	"	"	41	78	53	25

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	9	1	6	0	0	1	1	0	7	Houghton-Mifflin	5	130	33	30	3
							1	1	0	8	"	"	118	34	27	7
							1	1	0	9	"	"	68	59	42	17
							1	1	1	0	"	"	45	69	45	24
							1	1	1	3	"	"	48	55	41	14
							1	1	1	8	"	"	5	20	9	11
							1	3	0	4	"	"	19	6	1	5
							1	3	0	5	"	"	53	57	41	16
							1	3	0	6	"	"	34	25	22	3
							1	9	0	1	"	"	16	60	32	28
							1	1	0	1	"	6	34	37	32	5

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 9 1 6 0 0	1 1 0 3	Houghton-Mifflin	6	12	18	9	9
	1 1 0 7	"	"	66	4	3	1
	1 1 0 8	"	"	55	11	10	1
	1 1 0 9	"	"	34	16	16	-
	1 1 1 0	"	"	9	15	14	1
	1 1 1 3	"	"	9	16	14	2
	1 1 1 8	"	"	11	15	11	4
	1 3 0 4	"	"	17	5	3	2
	1 3 0 5	"	"	32	9	8	1
	1 3 0 6	"	"	28	3	-	3
	1 9 0 1	"	"	15	27	13	14

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	9	1	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	Houghton-Mifflin	7	13	3	3	-
							1	1	0	3	"	"	5	7	5	2
							1	1	0	7	"	"	15	1	1	-
							1	1	0	8	"	"	15	1	1	-
							1	1	0	9	"	"	12	4	4	-
							1	1	1	0	"	"	14	1	-	1
							1	1	1	3	"	"	2	10	10	-
							1	1	1	8	"	"	1	11	10	1
							1	3	0	4	"	"	6	6	1	5
							1	3	0	5	"	"	12	-	-	-
							1	3	0	6	"	"	9	3	3	-

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
				No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6 0 9 1 6 0 0	1 9 0 1	Houghton-Mifflin	7	-	15	9	6
	1 1 0 1	"	8	8	-	-	-
	1 1 0 3	"	"	2	1	1	-
	1 1 0 7	"	"	3	-	-	-
	1 1 0 8	"	"	3	-	-	-
	1 1 0 9	"	"	3	-	-	-
	1 1 1 0	"	"	3	-	-	-
	1 1 1 3	"	"	1	2	2	-
	1 1 1 8	"	"	2	1	1	-
	1 3 0 4	"	"	2	1	-	-
	1 3 0 5	"	"	2	1	1	-

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	9	1	6	0	0	1	3	0	6	Houghton-Mifflin	8	3	-	-	-
							1	9	0	1	"	"	1	2	2	-

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #09-61685

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code					Activity Code			(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
												N	%		Number/ Reason
6	0	8	1	5	7	2	0	15	Houghton Mifflin IPMS	221	213	8	3.6	Delayed arrival of tests	1
														Excessive absence	7
6	0	8	1	6	7	2	0	16	"	517	454	63	12.2	Delayed arrival of tests	35
														Excessive absence	28
6	0	9	1	5	7	2	0	15	"	224	220	4	1.8	Delayed arrival of tests	4
6	0	9	1	6	7	2	0	16	"	439	421	18	4.1	Delayed arrival of tests	18

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).

(3) Number of participants in the activity.

(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.

(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.

(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

1975-76 School Year

Due Date: July 1, 1976

SED Project Number: 3 0 7 5 0 0 - 7 6 0 0 1

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only): 0 9 6 1 6 8 6

Project Title BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION OF PREGNANT SCHOOL AGE GIRLS 1975-76

School District Name B/E NYC

School District Address 110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Irene Strum

Title School Research Associate

Telephone Number 212 (Area Code) 596 - 8376

Date this form was completed 6 / 15 / 76

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard bScore 2/	Date	Standard bScore 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
1	6	6	7	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	a	CES	DES	4	4	15	4/76	2.1	5/76	2.3	1	d	4/76	e
2											"	CES	DES	4	4	"	4/76	1.2	5/76	1.3	1	d	4/76	"
3											"	CES	DES	4	4	"	4/76	0	5/76	0	1	d	4/76	"
4											"	CES	DES	4	4	"	4/76	2.8	5/76	3.0	1	d	4/76	"
5											"	CES	DES	4	4	"	9/75	2.1	11/75	2.3	2	d	9/75	"
6											"	CES	DES	4	4	"	9/75	2.4	11/75	2.4	2	d	9/75	"
7											"	CES	DES	4	4	"	3/76	1.4	5/76	2.2	2	d	3/76	"
8											"	CES	DES	4	4	"	4/76	1.3	5/76	1.6	1	d	4/76	"
9											"	CES	DES	4	4	"	3/76	1.5	5/76	2.5	2	d	3/76	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura

b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC Language Assessment Battery

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard bScore 2/	Date	Standard bScore 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
10	6 6 7 1 5 0 0	7 2 0	a	CES	DES	4	4	15	4/76	1.2	5/76	1.4	1	d	4/76	e
11			"	DES	CES	1	1	"	3/76	21.3	5/76	24.0	1	"	3/76	"
12			"	DES	CES	1	1	"	11/75	23.6	1/76	26.0	1	"	11/75	"
13	6 6 7 1 6 0 0	7 2 0	a	CES	DES	4	4	16	10/75	3.5	11/75	3.7	1	"	10/75	"
14			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	3.8	11/75	3.8	1	"	10/75	"
15			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	3.3	11/75	3.3	1	"	10/75	"
16			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	3.3	12/75	3.5	2	"	10/75	"
17			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	1.8	11/75	2.4	1	"	9/75	"
18			"	"	"	"	"	"	3/76	2.3	5/76	2.5	2	"	3/76	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura

b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC Language Assessment Battery

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		Number of Contact Hours 3/ [c]	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score[b] 2/	Date	Standard Score[b] 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
19	6 6 7 1 6 0 0	7 2 0	a	CES	DES	4	4	16	4/76	2.3	5/76	2.5	1	d	4/76	e
20									10/75	3.0	11/75	3.2	1		10/75	
21									10/75	2.8	11/75	3.1	1		10/75	
22									9/75	2.4	11/75	3.0	2		9/75	
23									9/75	2.2	11/75	2.6	2		9/75	
24									9/75	2.0	11/75	2.5	2		9/75	
25									9/75	2.9	10/75	3.1	1		9/75	
26						3	3		3/76	13.7	5/76	22.7	1		3/76	
27				DES	CES	1	1		11/75	14/6	1/76	19.6	1		11/75	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura
b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC Language Assessment Battery
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard b Score 2/	Date	Standard b Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
28	6	6	7	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	a	CES	DES	4	4	15	2/76	2.0	5/76	2.6	3	d	2/76	e
29																	2/76	2.2	5/76	2.2	3		2/76	
30																	11/75	3.0	2/76	3.3	3		11/75	
31																	11/75	2.2	2/76	2.5	3		11/75	
32																	10/75	1.5	1/76	2.7	3		10/75	
33												DES	CES	1	1		2/76	6.3	5/76	18.3	3		2/76	
34														2	2		2/76	9.3	5/76	18.7	3		2/76	
35	6	6	7	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	a	CES	DES	4	4	16	2/76	1.4	5/76	1.8	3		2/76	
36																	2/76	1.8	5/76	2.2	3		2/76	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura

b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC Language Assessment Battery

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard b Score 2/	Date	Standard b Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
37	6	6	7	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	a	CES	DES	4	4	16	2/76	1.0	5/76	1.3	3	d	2/76	e
38											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.8	1/76	2.3	3	"	10/75	"
39											"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	2.5	12/75	2.8	3	"	9/75	"
40											"	"	"	"	"	"	2/76	2.4	5/76	5.7	3	"	2/76	"
41											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.9	1/76	2.5	3	"	10/75	"
42	6	6	7	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	15	10/75	2.4	2/76	2.7	4	"	10/75	"
43											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.6	2/76	2.0	4	"	10/75	
44											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.8	2/76	2.2	4	"	10/75	"
45											"	"	"	3	3	"	9/75	8.0	1/76	17.3	4	"	9/75	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura
b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC Language Assessment Battery
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard b Score 2/	Date	Standard b Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
46	6 6 7 1 5 0 0	7 2 0	a	CES	DES	3	3	15	12/75	19.7	4/76	25.7	4	d	12/75	e
47	6 6 7 1 6 0 0	7 2 0	"	"	"	4	4	16	10/75	1.9	2/76	2.5	4	"	10/75	"
48			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	2.1	2/76	2.5	4	"	10/75	"
49			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.9	2/76	2.7	4	"	10/75	"
50			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	2.3	1/76	2.5	4	"	9/75	"
51			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	2.5	2/76	2.5	4	"	10/75	"
52			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	2.0	2/76	2.3	4	"	10/75	"
53			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.8	2/76	2.1	4	"	10/75	"
54			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	0	2/76	1.8	4	"	10/75	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura

b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC Language Assessment Battery

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard b Score 2/	Date	Standard b Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
55	6 6 7 1 6 0 0	7 2 0	a	CES	DES	4	4	16	10/75	1.9	2/76	2.4	4	d	10/75	e
56									10/75	1.4	2/76	2.2	4		10/75	
57									10/75	2.3	2/76	2.5	4		10/75	
58									10/75	0	2/76	1.5	4		10/75	
59									10/75	2.2	2/76	2.4	4		10/75	
60									9/75	3.5	1/76	3.6	4		9/75	
61									10/75	3.1	2/76	3.3	4		10/75	
62									10/75	3.2	2/76	3.5	4		10/75	
63									10/75	2.5	2/76	3.0	4		10/75	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura
b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC Language Assessment Battery
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard b Score 2/	Date	Standard b Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
64	6 6 7 1 6 0 0	7 2 0	a	CES	DES	4	4	16	10/75	2.1	2/76	2.6	4	d	10/75	e
65			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.8	2/76	2.3	4	"	10/75	"
66			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	2.1	2/76	2.7	4	"	10/75	"
67			"	DES	CES	3	3	"	9/75	21.3	1/76	26.3	4	"	9/75	"
68			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	26.7	1/76	39.0	4	"	9/75	"
69	6 6 7 1 5 0 0	7 2 0	"	CES	DES	4	4	15	12/75	2.2	5/76	2.2	5	"	12/75	"
70			"	"	"	"	"	"	12/75	1.0	5/76	2.0	5	"	12/75	"
71			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	2.1	2/76	2.1	5	"	9/75	"
72			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	2.2	2/76	2.5	5	"	9/75	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura
b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC Language Assessment Battery
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard b Score 2/	Date	Standard b Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
73	6 6 7 1 5 0 0	7 2 0	a	CES	DES	4	4	15	9/75	2.7	2/76	2.8	5	d	9/75	e
74									9/75	0	2/76	1.3	5			
75									9/75	2.2	2/76	2.0	5			
76									9/75	2.4	2/76	2.8	5			
77									9/75	1.5	2/76	2.0	5			
78									9/75	2.8	2/76	2.9	5			
79									9/75	1.3	2/76	1.8	5			
80									9/75	2.1	2/76	2.1	5			
81									10/75	2.5	3/76	2.8	5		10/75	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura

b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC Language Assessment Battery

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard b Score 2/	Date	Standard b Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
82	6671500	720	a	DES	CES	1	1	15	9/75	11.6	2/76	18.3	5	d	9/75	e
83	6671600	720	a	CES	DES	4	4	16	9/75	1.7	2/76	2.1	5	"	9/75	"
84			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	1.8	2/76	2.3	5	"	9/75	"
85			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	2.4	2/76	2.6	5	"	9/75	"
86			"	"	"	"	"	"	12/75	1.5	5/76	2.3	5	"	12/75	"
87			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	2.4	2/76	2.7	5	"	9/75	"
88			"	"	"	"	"	"	12/75	19.7	5/76	27.0	5	"	12/75	"
89			"	"	"	3	3	"	12/75	20.7	5/76	26.7	5	"	12/75	"
90			"	DES	CES	3	3	"	9/75	23.3	2/76	34.0	5	"	9/75	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura
b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC Language Assessment Battery
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard b Score 2/	Date	Standard bScore 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
91	6	6	7	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	a	DES	CES	1	1	16	12/75	18.6	5/76	22.6	5	d	12/75	e
92											"	CES	DES	3	3	"	12/75	19.7	5/76	27.0	5	"	12/75	"
93	6	6	7	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	a	CES	DES	4	4	15	11/75	1.2	5/76	1.4	6	"	11/75	"
94											"	"	"	"	"	"	11/75	2.5	5/76	2.5	6	"	11/75	"
95	6	6	7	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	16	11/75	2.2	5/76	2.7	6	"	11/75	"
96											"	"	"	"	"	"	11/75	1.8	5/76	2.4	6	"	11/75	"
97											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	2.8	4/76	3.1	6	"	10/75	"
98	6	6	7	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	15	10/75	1.5	5/76	1.6	7	"	10/75	"
99											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	2.3	5/76	2.8	7	"	10/75	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
a. Prueba De Lectura
b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC Language Assessment Battery
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard bScore 2/	Date	Standard bScore 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
100	6	6	7	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	a	CES	DES	4	4	15	10/75	1.5	5/76	2.3	7	d	10/75	e
101																	10/75	1.3	5/76	2.4	7			
102																	10/75	1.0	5/76	2.0	7			
103																	10/75	1.5	5/76	2.0	7			
104	6	6	7	1	6	0	0	7	2	0						16	10/75	2.0	5/76	2.9	7			
105																	10/75	2.1	5/76	2.9	7			
106																	10/75	2.0	5/76	2.4	7			
107																	10/75	3.0	5/76	3.2	7			
108																	10/75	2.8	5.76	3.1	7			

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura
b. Standard Scores are unavailable; raw score reported
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC Language Assessment Battery
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard b Score 2/	Date	Standard b Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
109	6	6	7	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	a	CES	DES	4	4	16	10/75	2.0	5/76	2.8	7	d	10/75	e
110											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	2.0	5/76	2.7	7	"	"	"
111											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.9	5/76	2.5	7	"	"	"
112											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.9	5/76	2.4	7	"	"	"
113											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	1.7	5/76	2.5	7	"	"	"
114											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	2.2	5/76	2.6	7	"	"	"
115											"	DES	CES	2	2	"	10/75	10.0	5/76	14.0	7	"	"	"
116	6	6	7	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	"	CES	DES	4	4	15	9/75	2.1	5/76	2.0	8	"	9/75	"
117	6	6	7	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	16	9/75	2.5	5/76	2.9	8	"	9/75	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

a. Prueba De Lectura

b. Standard scores are unavailable; raw score reported

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC Language Assessment Battery

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
11	6	6	6	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Read	H	G	Int	Int	15	3/76	4.9	5/76	5.6	1	d	3/76	e
133											"	"		"	"	"	4/76	3.9	"	4.2	"	"	4/76	"
18	6	6	6	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	"	G	H	"	"	16	3/76	5.8	5/76	5.8	2	"	3/76	"
26											"	H	G	Adv	Adv	"	"	1.8	"	3.4	1	"	3/76	"
27											"	"	F	"	"	"	11/75	6.9	1/76	7.1	1	"	11/75	"
28	6	6	6	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	"	G	H	Int	Int	15	2/76	4.6	5/76	5.0	3	"	2/76	
29											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.5	"	4.9	"	"	"	"
33											"	H	G	"	"	"	"	3.4	"	4.1	"	"	"	"
34											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3.8	"	4.0	"	"	"	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC LAB

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
128	6	6	6	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Read	H	G	Adv	Adv	15	2/76	7.8	5/76	8.0	3	d	2/76	e
129											"	"	"	Int	Int	15	2/76	6.2	5/76	6.7	3	"	2/76	"
44											"	G	H	"	"	15	10/75	5.7	2/76	6.5	4	"	10/75	"
67	6	6	6	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	"	H	F	Adv	Adv	16	9/75	6.4	1/76	6.7	"	"	9/75	"
49											"	G	H	Int	Int	16	10/75	6.9	2/76	7.9	"	"	10/75	"
53											"	"	"	"	"	16	"	6.2	"	7.8	"	"	10/75	"
61											"	"	"	"	"	16	"	8.4	"	9.8	"	"	10/75	"
72	6	6	6	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	15	9/75	3.8	2/76	4.8	5	"	9/75	"
82											"	H	G	"	"	15	"	3.8	"	4.0	"	"	"	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC LAB

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		Number of Contact Hours 3/ c	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
126	6	6	6	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Read	H	G	Int	Int	15	10/75	4.2	3/76	5.3	5	d	10/75	e
130											"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	6.6	2/76	7.4	"	"	9/75	"
131											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.5	"	4.5	"	"	"	"
119	6	6	6	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	"	H	F	Adv	Adv	16	12/75	9.0	5/76	9.6	"	"	12/75	"
92											"	"	G	"	"	"	"	6.2	"	6.9	"	"	"	"
96	6	6	6	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	"	G	H	Int	Int	16	11/75	5.3	5/76	6.0	6	"	11/75	"
124											"	H	G	Adv	Adv	"	9/75	4.1	3/76	4.2	"	"	9/75	"
127	6	6	6	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	Int	Int	15	10/75	7.3	5/76	6.6	7	"	10/75	"
132											"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	5.3	4/76	5.4	"	"	9/75	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC IAB

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
99	6	6	6	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Read	G	H	Int	Int	15	10/75	2.8	5/76	3.1	7	d	10/75	e
104	6	6	6	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	16	"	5.0	"	6.9	"	"	"	"
109											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	7.1	"	7.6	"	"	"	
110											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.2	"	4.6	"	"	"	"
121											"	H	G	Adv	Adv	"	10/75	5.5	"	5.3	"	"	"	"
115											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.8	"	5.9	"	"	"	"
118											"	H	F	Adv	Adv	"	9/75	12.4	5/76	12.4	7	"	9/75	"
125											"	H	G	Int	Int	"	10/75	3.4	5/76	3.8	"	"	10/75	"
117											"	G	H	Int	Int	"	9/75	7.3	5/76	9.8	8	"	9/75	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC LAB
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
123	6	6	6	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Read	H	G	Adv	Adv	16	9/75	4.6	5/76	5.2	8	d	9/75	e
5	6	6	8	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int	Int	15	9/75	5.2	11/75	6.1	2		9/75	
9																	3/76	6.6	5/76	7.6	2		3/76	
10																	4/76	6.6	5/76	7.6	1		4/76	
11																	3/76	4.9	5/76	5.6	1		3/76	
13	6	6	8	1	6	0	0	7	2	0						16	10/75	6.3	11/75	6.7	1		10/75	
122																	3/76	5.2	5/76	5.6	1		3/76	
26																	3/76	2.5	5/76	4.9	1		3/76	
27																	11/75	5.9	1/76	6.0	1		11/75	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC LAB
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
14	6	6	8	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int	Int	16	10/75	4.2	11/75	4.7	1	d	10/75	e
15											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3.9	"	4.6	"	"	"	
16											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	5.2	12/75	5.5	2	"	10/75	
17											"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	2.9	11/75	3.7	1	"	9/75	
20											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	6.5	11/75	7.5	1	"	10/75	
22											"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	4.5	11/75	4.8	2	"	9/75	
28	6	6	8	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	"	2/76	5.7	5/76	6.2	3	"	2/76	
29											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3.5	"	5.1	"	"	"	
30											"	"	"	"	"	"	11/75	6.2	2/76	7.1	"	"	11/75	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

c. Numberof months in program
d. NYC LAB
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
31	6 6 8 1 5 0 0	7 2 0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int	Int	15	11/75	3.2	2/76	4.1	3	d	11/75	e
33									2/76	4.3	5/76	4.5			2/76	
34									2/76	4.8	5/76	5.6			2/76	
128									2/76	6.7	5/76	7.1				
129										6.0		6.7				
35	6 6 8 1 6 0 0	7 2 0						16		5.9		6.1				
36										4.7		4.9				
38									10/75	4.2	1/76	4.1			10/75	
40									2/76	6.5	5/76	7.5			2/76	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC LAB
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
42	6	6	8	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int	Int	15	10/75	4.3	2/76	4.4	4	d	10/75	e
43																	10/75	4.8	2/76	4.9	4		10/75	
44																	10/75	4.8	2/76	5.5	4		10/75	
67	6	6	8	1	6	0	0	7	2	0						16	9/75	5.7	1/76	6.7	4		9/75	
63																	10/75	5.4	2/76	6.3	4		10/75	
64																	10/75	7.1	2/76	8.2	4		10/75	
65																	10/75	5.2	2/76	6.1	4		10/75	
66																	10/75	5.1	2/76	5.9	4		10/75	
47																	10/75	5.4	2/76	5.9	4		10/75	

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC LAB
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
48	6 6 8 1 6 0 0	7 2 0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int	Int	16	10/75	3.4	2/76	3.6	4	d	10/75	e
49			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5.7	"	6.4	"	"	"	"
51			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5.3	"	5.5	"	"	"	"
52			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	6.9	"	7.3	"	"	"	"
54			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5.4	"	5.5	"	"	"	"
55			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	7.4	"	7.8	"	"	"	"
56			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	6.1	"	5.9	"	"	"	"
57			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	6.3	"	6.1	"	"	"	"
59			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.3	"	4.4	"	"	"	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC LAB

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
61	6 6 8 1 6 0 0	7 2 0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int	Int	16	10/75	7.4	2/76	9.9	4	d	10/75	e
82	6 6 8 1 5 0 0	7 2 0	"	"	"	"	"	15	9/75	4.6	2/76	5.6	5	"	9/75	"
126			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	3.6	3/76	3.8	"	"	10/75	"
130			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	6.0	2/76	6.4	"	"	9/75	"
131			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5.2	"	5.6	"	"	"	"
70			"	"	"	"	"	15	12/75	5.3	5/76	6.2	5	"	12/75	"
71			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	4.2	2/76	4.5	"	"	9/75	"
76			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.2	"	3.7	"	"	"	"
78			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.6	"	5.2	"	"	"	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).

2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.

3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.

4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.

c. Number of months in program

d. NYC LAB

e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
79	6 6 8 1 5 0 0	7 2 0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int.	Int.	15	9/75	3.2	2/76	4.1	5	d	9/75	e
80			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	2.1	2/76	3.2	"		"	"
83	6 6 8 1 6 0 0		"	"	"	"	"	16	"	4.1	"	4.3	"		"	"
84			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	2.8	"	3.3	"		"	"
85			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5.6	"	6.1	"		"	"
86			"	"	"	"	"	"	12/75	4.9	5/76	5.3	"		12/75	"
87			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	6.1	2/76	6.9	"		9/75	"
119			"	"	"	"	"	"	12/75	6.7	5/76	7.1	"		12/75	"
92			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	6.0	"	8.0	"		"	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC LAB
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
93	6	6	8	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int	Int	15	11/75	4.1	5/76	4.8	6	d	11/75	e
96	6	6	8	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	16	"	4.5	"	4.6	"	"	"	"
124											"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	4.9	3/76	5.6	"	"	9/75	"
97											"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	6.1	4/76	7.1	"	"	10/75	"
98	6	6	8	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	15	10/75	3.9	5/76	3.8	7	"	"	"
99											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3.8	"	4.6	"	"	"	"
100											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.7	"	5.1	"	"	"	"
101											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3.9	"	4.1	"	"	"	"
103											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.8	"	4.1	"	"	"	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC LAB
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
				Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
127	6 6 8 1 5 0 0	7 2 0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int	Int	15	10/75	7.5	5/76	7.8	7	d	10/75	e
132			"	"	"	"	"	15	9/75	4.3	4/76	3.0	7	"	9/75	"
121	6 6 8 1 6 0 0	7 2 0	"	"	"	"	"	16	10/75	5.1	5/76	5.6	"	"	10/75	"
115			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	5.7	5/76	6.4	"	"	10/75	"
118			"	"	"	"	"	"	9/75	9.8	5/76	10.4	"	"	9/75	"
125			"	"	"	"	"	"	10/75	4.6	5/76	4.2	"	"	10/75	"
104			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	6.0	"	6.4	"	"	"	"
105			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5.4	"	5.9	"	"	"	"
106			"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3.1	"	3.2	"	"	"	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC LAB
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

Table 12 Components with small number of eligible participants. (Replaces Table 29 of 1974-75 MIR)

If the district funded a project in which the total number of pupils treated by any component code summed to 30 or less, please use the following table. Do not identify each pupil by name; assign each pupil a permanent student number, and give complete test information on each pupil as indicated in the table. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Pupil #	Component Code							Activity Code			Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Grade Level	Achievement Pretest		Achievement Posttest		c Number of Contact Hours 3/	Screening Test 4/		
												Pre	Post	Pre	Post		Date	Standard Score 2/	Date	Standard Score 2/		Test 1/	Date	Standard Score 2/
107	6	6	8	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	Mat70 Math	F	G	Int	Int	16	10/75	5.2	5/76	5.7	7	d	10/75	e
108											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3.7	"	4.9	"	"	"	"
110											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.5	"	5.1	"	"	"	"
111											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	6.8	"	7.2	"	"	"	"
112											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5.1	"	6.8	"	"	"	"
114											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	4.5	"	5.6	"	"	"	"
116	6	6	8	1	5	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	15	9/75	3.1	"	4.3	8	"	9/75	"
123	6	6	8	1	6	0	0	7	2	0	"	"	"	"	"	16	9/75	3.1	"	4.0	"	"	"	"
120											"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5.7	"	5.3	"	"	"	"

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58 reading; CAT-70 math, etc).
2/ Publisher's Standard Score. (See publisher's manual). Scaled scores are also acceptable.
3/ Enter the total number of contact hours that this individual received in supplementary services from this funding source.
4/ (Same as #1 above). The screening test is the test that was employed to establish eligibility during the needs assessment/planning phase of the project.
c. Number of months in program
d. NYC LAB
e. Teacher assessment and score taken as indicator of need for bilingual instruction

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30)   Function #________

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	%	(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
								absence	9
6 6 7 1 5	7 2 0	15	a	64	47	17	26.6	delivery of baby	8
								absence	5
6 6 7 1 6	7 2 0	16	a	92	70	22	23.9	delivery of baby & subsequent discharge	17
			Mat70					absence	31
6 6 6 1 5	7 2 0	15	Read	64	17	47	73.4	delivery of baby & subsequent discharge	16
			Mat70					absence	51
6 6 6 1 6	7 2 0	16	Read	92	20	72	78.3	delivery of baby & subsequent discharge	21
			Mat70					absence	17
6 6 8 1 5	7 2 0	15	Math	64	34	30	46.9	delivery of baby & subsequent discharge	13

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).

(3) Number of participants in the activity.

(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.

(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.

(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

a Prueba de Lectura

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #_______

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code					Activity Code			(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
												N	%		Number/ Reason
6	6	8	1	6	7	2	0	.16	Mat 70 Math	92	55	37	40.2	absence	17
														delivery of baby & subsequent discharge	20

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

2/75

CORRECTIVE READING, CORRECTIVE MATHEMATICS AND BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION OF PREGNANT SCHOOL AGE GIRLS

ABSTRACT

The corrective reading, corrective mathematics, and Bilingual programs for pregnant school age girls was aimed at providing continuity of instruction for pregnant girls who were at least two years behind their grade level in grade equivalent test scores. The corrective reading and corrective mathematics program used a diagnostic/prescriptive approach to instruction. The program tests used for diagnosis and mastery testing were used for program evaluation. In the Bilingual Component, Prueba de Lectura, and MAT's in reading and mathematics were administered.

Five distributions were obtained from the diagnostic/prescriptive test results reported by classroom teachers, which formed the core of the evaluation results. Analysis of the classroom testing data indicated that more than 80% of the students in reading and mathematics achieved mastery in at least one instructional objective, figures that were below the program goal of 70% achieving mastery in one instructional objective per month of instruction. Further analysis showed that many students had mastered a significant number of objectives prior to instruction, and that some teachers administered relatively few objective tests to their students. Excessive absence and delivery of baby were explanations given by teachers. Analysis of student objective achievement by objective indicated that reading instruction was most effective in structural analysis and vocabulary, and somewhat less effective in reading comprehension. In mathematics, objective achievement was most prominent in numbers and operations. At the program's conclusion, more than 60% of the students in reading and more than 70% of the students in mathematics had achieved mastery on all objectives for which they had failed.

In the Bilingual component, statistically significant increases in reading and mathematics were obtained.

A discrepancy analysis indicated that there could have been serious problems associated with staffing and lack of sufficient materials and equipment as well as late arrival of diagnostic materials. The effectiveness of staff was responsible for program successes despite adverse conditions.

LIST OF OBJECTIVES

READING

Structural Analyses

- Word Endings
  - Prefixes, Suffixes, Affixes
  - Syllabication

Vocabulary

- Synonyms
- Antonyms
- Word Meanings

Comprehension

- Classifying
- Inferences, Cause or Effect
- Facts and Details
- Following Directions
- Main Ideas
- Drawing Conclusions

MATHEMATICS

Numbers, Operations and Applications

- Ordering of Numbers
- Number Sentences
- Exponential Notation
- Fractions
- Addition
- Subtraction
- Multiplication
- Division

Measurement

- Temperature
- Monetary System
- Time and Date

Problem Solving

- Analysis of Problems